

LEVY DAVIS & MAHER, LLP  
 Jonathan A. Bernstein (JB 4053)  
 880 Third Avenue  
 New York, New York 10022  
 (212) 371-0033

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----- x  
 LEONIDES CEGEDA and PASCUAL CEGEDA, :  
 :  
 individually and on behalf of all others similarly : 07 Civ. 4656 (RWS) (RLE)  
 situated, :  
 :  
 Plaintiffs, : ANSWER  
 :  
 - against - :  
 :  
 ENCHILADA BOB, INC. db/a/ BIG ENCHILADA :  
 and ROBERT PALUMBO, :  
 :  
 Defendants. :  
 ----- x

Defendants Enchilada Bob, Inc., d/b/a Big Enchilada (hereinafter "Enchilada") and Robert Palumbo,(hereinafter "Palumbo"), by their attorneys, Levy Davis & Maher, LLP, as and for their Answer to plaintiff's Complaint, allege as follows:

1. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 1 of the Complaint.
2. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 2 of the Complaint.
3. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 3 of the Complaint except admit that plaintiffs plaintiff purport to sue under the statutes and regulation cited.
4. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 4 of the Complaint except admit that plaintiffs purport to proceed as alleged.
5. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 5 of the Complaint except admit

that plaintiffs purport to raise a federal question.

6. Defendants admit that venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 and otherwise admit the allegations of Paragraph 6 of the Complaint.

7. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 7 of the Complaint except admit that Cegeda was employed from August 2003 until approximately December 2004 and deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to Cegeda's residence.

8. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 8 of the Complaint except deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to Pascual's residence.

9. Defendant admits the allegations of Paragraph 9 of the Complaint.

10. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 10 of the Complaint, except admit that Palumbo is an individual, is the principal of Enchilada, and that plaintiffs purport to sue on the theory stated in their Complaint.

11. Defendants deny, upon information and belief, the allegations of Paragraph 11 of the Complaint, except admits that plaintiffs sometimes worked in excess of 40 hours per week and/or more than ten hours in a day.

12. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 12 of the Complaint.

13. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 13 of the Complaint, except admit that Cegeda requested and was given additional shifts.

14. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 14 of the Complaint except admit that Cegeda received tips, was paid \$40 per delivery shift and that precise records of tips were not maintained. Defendants aver that plaintiffs lack standing to prosecute defendants' alleged record keeping violations.

15. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 15 of the Complaint except admit that plaintiff sometimes worked 66 hours per week from August 2006 through January 2007.

16. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 16 of the Complaint except admit that records were not maintained in the form required by the U.S. Department of Labor and aver that plaintiffs lack standing to prosecute defendants' alleged record keeping violations.

17. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 17 of the Complaint except admit that plaintiffs were paid in cash at their request.

18. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 18 of the Complaint and aver that plaintiffs lack standing to prosecute defendants' alleged meal break violations.

19. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 19 of the Complaint except deny that Palumbo's title is owner or executive director.

20. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 20 of the Complaint.

21. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 21 of the Complaint.

22. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 22 of the Complaint.

23. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 23 of the Complaint.

24. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 24 of the Complaint.

#### **AS TO THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

25. Defendants incorporate by reference each and every allegation previously set forth as if more fully set forth herein.

26. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 26 of the Complaint.

27. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 27 of the Complaint.

28. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 28 of the Complaint.
29. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 29 of the Complaint.
30. Defendant deny the allegations of Paragraph 30 of the Complaint.
31. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 31 of the Complaint.

**AS TO THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

32. Defendants incorporate by reference each and every allegation previously set forth as if more fully set forth herein.
33. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 33 of the Complaint.
34. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 34 of the Complaint.
35. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 35 of the Complaint.

**AS TO THE THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

36. Defendant incorporates by reference each and every allegation previously set forth as if more fully set forth herein.
37. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 37 of the Complaint.
38. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 38 of the Complaint.
39. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 39 of the Complaint.
40. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 40 of the Complaint.

**AS TO THE FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

41. Defendant incorporates by reference each and every allegation previously set forth

as if more fully set forth herein.

42. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 42 of the Complaint.
43. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 43 of the Complaint.
44. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 44 of the Complaint.
45. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 45 of the Complaint.

**AS TO THE FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

46. Defendant incorporates by reference each and every allegation previously set forth as if more fully set forth herein.
47. Defendants deny, upon information and belief, the allegations of Paragraph 47 of the Complaint.
48. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 48 of the Complaint.
49. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 49 of the Complaint.
50. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 50 of the Complaint.
51. Defendants deny that plaintiffs are entitled to the relief set forth in their prayer for relief.

**FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

52. The Complaint fails in whole or in part to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

**SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

53. The Complaint is barred, in whole or in part, by applicable statutes of limitations.

**THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

54. The answering defendants did not own or operate the restaurant prior to August 2003.

**FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

55. Defendant Enchilada did not own or operate the restaurant prior to February 2004.

WHEREFORE, defendants Enchilada Bob, Inc. and Robert Palumbo request that judgment be entered against plaintiffs dismissing this action in its entirety and awarding them attorney's fees, costs and disbursements and such other and further relief as this Court may deem just, fair and equitable.

Dated: New York, New York  
July 26, 2007

LEVY DAVIS & MAHER, LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/ \_\_\_\_\_

Jonathan A. Bernstein (JB 4053)  
Attorneys for Defendants  
880 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10022  
(212) 371-0033

To: Michael Faillace (MF 8436)  
Michael Faillace and Associates, P.C.  
110 East 59th Street, 32nd Floor  
New York, New York 10022  
(212) 317-1200  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs